REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed August 22, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 10-14 and 16-24 remain in this application, where claims 8-9 and 15 had been canceled without prejudice and claim 24 has been added. Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 14 and 23 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 6, 11-13, 16-17 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065810 (Bradley). Claims 2-3, 7, 18-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bradley in view of Official Notice. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bradley. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bradley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,958 (Orcutt) and Official Notice. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over

Bradley in view of Official Notice and MRAM as disclosed in

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MRAM.   It is respectfully submitted

that claims 1-7, 10-14 and 16-24 are patentable over Bradley,

Orcutt, Official Notice and MRAM for at least the following

reasons.

On page 3 of the Office Action, paragraphs [0034] and [0044]-

[0045] of Bradley are cited to allegedly show mapping means adapted

to split an image of the first file system into different

categories based on properties of data structures, and to store the

different categories in different files of the second file system,

as recited in independent claims 1, 5, 10, 14 and 23.

It is respectfully submitted that paragraphs [0034] and

[0044]-[0045] of Bradley merely disclose that "objects of the

object-based dynamic flat file system are configured to be one of a

"volume" class, a "directory" class or a "file" class."   (Paragraph

[0034], lines 16-18)   FIGs 2A-2C and Paragraphs [0044]-[0045]

describe a directory class 202, a file class 204, and a volume

class 206.   For example, as described in paragraphs [0045]

different directory type objects are separate instances of the

directory class and as such, may have different attribute values,

while different directory-type objects may be subjected to the same

operations.

It is respectfully submitted that Bradley is not concerned

with any record carrier, and is rather concerned with computer

systems. Further, paragraphs [0034] and [0044]-[0045] of Bradley

do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in

independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 5,

10, 14 and 23 which, amongst other patentable elements recites

(illustrative emphasis provided):

> wherein said mapping means is further adapted to
> split said image of said first file system into
> different categories based on properties of data
> structures, and to store said different categories in
> different files of said second file system.

These features are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Bradley.

Assuming, arguendo, that Bradley discloses or suggests splitting

the image of a first file system into different categories, Bradley

still does not disclose or suggest storing the different categories

in different files of the second file system.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent

claims 1, 5, 10, 14 and 23 be allowed.   In addition, it is

respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 6-7, 11-13, 16-22 and 24

should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from

independent claim 1 as well as their individually patentable

elements.   Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the

dependent claims is respectfully requested.

For example, on page 7 of the Office Action, it is correctly

noted that Bradley does not disclose or suggest "wherein said

mapping means is arranged to store <u>static data</u> structures **of said**

first file system <u>in a file on said record carrier</u> and <u>volatile</u>

<u>data</u> structures **of said first file** system <u>in said memory means</u>," as

recited in claim 21.   (Illustrative emphasis provided)   However,

Official Notice is taken that such features are well known.

If such features are in fact well known, as alleged, it should

be described in documents that the Examiner can provide.   Without

access to these documents, Applicants cannot evaluate whether it is

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them with

the references already of record.   Such documentation is

accordingly respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded. And in particular, no Official Notices are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
November 21, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

NL030420-amd-11-21-08.doc